

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Abexandria, Virginia 22313-1430 www.usplo.gov

PPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/023,178	12/17/2001	Gerald Reinders	Mo-6531/HR-245	3294	
7590 12/02/2003			EXAMINER		
Stephan A Pendorf			WONG, LESLIE A		
Pendorf & Pendorf & Pendorfal		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
Tampa, FL 33634-7356			1761		
			DATE MAILED: 12/02/2003		

•

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applic	cation No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary			3,178	REINDERS ET AL.			
			ner	Art Unit			
		Leslie		1761			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Faillure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status							
1)	Responsive to communication(s) fi	led on .					
		2b)⊠ This action is	s non-final.				
3)□							
Disposition of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.  7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
	10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) includin						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> <li>13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet.</li> <li>37 CFR 1.78.</li> <li>a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.</li> <li>14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.</li> </ul>							
Attachment(s)							
2) 🔲 Notice	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (F ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) P			PTO-413) Paper No(s) atent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/023,178

Art Unit: 1761

The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered. It is suggested that Applicant provide a copy of the references cited in the specification, as they are not readily available to the Examiner.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Applicant does not clearly teach what is encompassed by "a base matrix comprising a flavor" as Applicant does not teach any and all flavors and matrices.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Application/Control Number: 10/023,178

Art Unit: 1761

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hornstein in view of Ashurst.

Hornstein discloses a process for identification of flavor mixtures comprising selecting a flavor, analyzing the flavor by subjecting isolates and fractions of the flavor to headspace analysis, and using sensory evaluation to evaluate the results (see entire document, especially pages 72, 75, and 83-92).

The claims differ as to the specific use of the data to prepare a flavor.

Ashurst discloses flavor manufacture based on analysis of flavor materials (see pages 122-125).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use prepare a flavor as taught by Ashurst from the information provided by Hornstein because the use of flavor analysis to product flavors is conventional in the art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leslie Wong whose telephone number is 703-308-1979. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on 703-308-3959. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9310.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

Leslie Wong

Primary Examiner Art Unit 1761

LAW November 26, 2003